

July 1, 2004

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/98)

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

HARMONY GROVE VILLAGE; GPA 04-04, R04-010, P04-012, P04-013,
P04-014, SP 04-03, TM 5365; LOG NO. 04-08-011

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact: Kristin Blackson, Planner II
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3012
c. E-mail: kristin.blackson@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project is located within unincorporated County of San Diego in the North County Metropolitan Subregional planning area. The 468-acre project site is located approximately three miles west of Interstate 15, approximately two miles south of SR-78 and bound by the City of Escondido to the east and City of San Marcos to the north-northwest. Locally, the project site is located north and south of Harmony Grove Road and east and west of Country Club Drive. Other roads crossing or abutting the project study area include Wilgen Road, Bresa de Loma Drive, Mount Whitney Road and Hillside Drive.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1129, Grid B,C,D/4,5,6

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

New Urban West (NUW) Management, LLC
520 Broadway, Suite 100
Santa Monica, CA 90401

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan: North County Metropolitan
 Existing Land Use
 Designation & Density: (17) Estate Residential - 1 du/2 & 4 acres
 (18) Multiple Rural Use - 1 du/4, 8, & 20 acres
 (19) Intensive Agriculture – 1 du/2, 8, & 20 acres
 (24) Impact Sensitive Area – 1 du/4, 8, 20 acres
 (24) Impact Sensitive/Extractive – 1-du/20 acres

7. Zoning

Existing Use Regulation
 & Density: (A-70) Limited Agriculture - .5 du/2 acres
 (A-72) General Agriculture – 1.25 du/8 acres
 (S-82) Extractive Use – no density allowed
 Special Area Regulation: A (A72 zone)

8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation):

The proposed Harmony Grove project is a mixed-use, rural residential village consisting of residential uses, commercial uses, open space and park and recreational uses, a sewer package treatment plant and various equestrian facilities including an equestrian ranch for horse boarding and lessons. The project application includes a Specific Plan, a Vesting Tentative Map and three Major Use Permits (MUPs). One MUP is being proposed for the Private Equestrian Ranch (PER), one MUP is proposed for the Wastewater Treatment Facility, and the third MUP is proposed for the remainder of the project site (e.g., residential, commercial, recreation). The proposed project is organized into seven planning areas based upon the types of land uses proposed. These planning areas are described in more detail in the Harmony Grove Village Specific Plan and summarized below in Table 1.

Table 1: Harmony Grove Village Planning Areas

Planning Area	Acres	% of Total Acreage	Housing Units	Comm./Retail s.f.
1. Harmony Village	81	17	365 du	
2. Village Center	12	3	28 du	40,000 s.f.*
3. South Creek	30	6	14 du	
4. The Hillside	140	30	124 du	
5. The Groves	84	18	112 du	
6. East Village	84	18	79 du	
7. Equestrian Ranch	37	8	3	
Total	468 ac.	100%	742 dwelling units	40,000 s.f.

- Includes 25,000 s.f. of general commercial (retail/office) and another 15,000 s.f. of live/work space.

Residential Uses: A variety of single-family residential unit types are proposed ranging from low density, large-lots in the Groves planning area to live/work dwellings in the Village Center. Lot sizes vary between 2,200 s.f. and over two acres and homes vary between approximately 1,500 s.f. and 5,000 s.f. A total of 32 dwelling units are proposed within the Village Center as part of the live/work mixed use area. The number of units per acre varies throughout the project site, with the overall gross density within the project not exceeding 1.6 dwelling units per acre. Proposed residential units will vary in architecture, as described in detail in the Specific Plan, with maximum building heights at 30 feet and three-stories.

Commercial/Retail: Some supporting commercial and retail uses are located within the Village Center (Planning Area 2) and are proposed to consist of establishments that would support primarily the Harmony Grove Village residents such as a coffee shop, delicatessen, business offices, post office, etc. The total gross acreage for office/retail use is two acres, not including the land proposed for the live/work buildings noted above. Approximately 25,000 s.f. is proposed for the commercial/retail uses, with another 15,000 s.f. anticipated within the live/work units. The on-site commercial and retail land uses are not solely for use by the Harmony Grove Village but are expected to attract a minimum number of residents from outside the Village.

Some retail sales are anticipated to be related to the proposed equestrian facilities within the Village, including sales associated with horse boarding, training and showing. Refer to Equestrian Facilities for further description of these proposed uses.

Institutional: A few pads are proposed to be reserved for institutional land uses, such as a fire station and a proposed sewer package treatment plant. The institutional land uses are located in Planning Area 6, the East Village. The proposed sewer package treatment plant is located east of Country Club Drive and would consist of the following elements: a 17,000 s.f. area with a 20' x 50' building which would house the control room, electrical equipment, air blowers and a small lab; an effluent storage area of approximately 40' x 50'; two adjacent equipment lots (15' x 50' and 20' x 50'); and a sludge bed covering an area of approximately 50' x 100'. The plant would treat effluent from all of the Harmony Grove Village development, with the exception of the Private Equestrian Ranch (Planning Area 7) which would utilize a septic system for effluent treatment/disposal. The plant is anticipated to be owned and operated either by a County Sanitation District or a California Water District which would have to be formed to own and operate the facility. The sewer treatment plant is proposed to employ the Zenon Process of treatment, producing tertiary treated effluent for use as reclaimed water for on-site irrigation. The effluent is proposed to meet the Title 22, Division 4 of the California Administrative Code for unrestricted irrigation reuse of reclaimed water.

Open Space and Recreation: A total of 200 acres of open space and recreational land uses are proposed, covering approximately 42 percent of the project study area. The open space uses include the following: 12 acres of parks (public and private), 8 acres of multi-use trails, 91 acres of naturalized open space and transitional open space area, 46 acres of landscaped open space, and 43 acres of equestrian facilities. The 12 acres of parkland consists of five public parks, including Village Square Park, Village Green Park, two South Creek Parks, and Hillside Park. In addition, a series of small, private recreation areas are planned within Harmony Village (Planning Area 1), including swimming pools, children's play areas and passive recreational areas.

The 43 acres of equestrian facilities are proposed in three locations throughout the Village, the Private Equestrian Ranch (37 acres), a two-acre equestrian facility located in Planning Area 4, and a four-acre facility located in Planning Area 3.

Equestrian Facilities: Three equestrian facilities are proposed within Harmony Grove Village: the 37-acre Private Equestrian Ranch (PER) located in Planning Area 7, south of Harmony Grove Road, a four-acre equestrian facility within Planning Area 3 (South Creek) and a two-acre equestrian facility within Planning Area 4 (The Hillside).

The PER is proposed to accommodate up to 80 horses for boarding and training and will include the following land uses: grass pasture, grass field, schooling ring, hunter ring, dressage arena, mare motel, main barn, dirt paddocks, hot walker and show arena. In addition to the proposed horse facilities, two single-family residences are proposed in addition to the existing home located in this area. Employees anticipated to operate the PER include: two independent contracting trainers (not living on-site), and one resident ranch manager (living on the premises). Hours of operation will be limited to daylight hours.

It is anticipated that approximately six times per year, the PER will host a horse show for up to 120 horses for each show, in addition to the 80 horses boarded on-site. The shows are expected to last approximately three-days over the weekend. Horse shows will require a temporary public address system. Horse boarding during these events is expected to be accommodated by temporary portable stalls set up near the show arenas in the southeast corner of the PER.

Parking and access roads within the eastern portion of the PER are proposed to be surfaced with gravel, small rock or ground asphalt. Parking for lessons and the occasional horse show will be accommodated within Planning Area 7. On-street parking is not proposed.

Some retail sales are anticipated within the PER, providing supplies for horse boarding, training and showing. A maximum of 3,500 s.f. is expected for retail

purposes. Temporary commercial stands are also expected to be set up on show days.

A manure disposal plan is proposed to be prepared that includes manure removal twice a week via a commercial dumpster. No hazardous materials are proposed to be stored on-site. A fly/pest control system (automatic) is proposed to be installed in the main barn and outside corral areas. Each arena is proposed to include a watering system to control dust.

The equestrian facilities proposed within Planning Areas 3 and 4 are proposed to consist of small community equestrian boarding and exercise facilities.

Landscaping: A detailed landscape plan has been developed for the proposed project and is described in the Specific Plan in text with supporting graphics. Five major landscape zones are proposed for Harmony Grove Village: 1) Natural/Transitional Landscape Zone; 2) Riparian Landscape Zone; 3) Valley Landscape Zone; 4) Hillside Landscape Zone; and 5) Grove Landscape Zone. Refer to Chapter III.E. of the Specific Plan for the proposed landscape design. This plan also includes details relative to proposed lighting and fencing.

Construction and Grading: Proposed landform modifications include approximately 2,879,800 cubic yards of cut at a maximum cut slope ratio of 1.5:1 and approximately 2,852,500 cubic yards of fill with a maximum fill slope ratio of 2:1. Maximum cut height is expected to be 30 feet and maximum fill slope height is anticipated to be 40 feet. No retaining walls are proposed. Some blasting is anticipated for project grading and is identified on the project grading plan.

Circulation: Four changes are proposed to the existing circulation system in the project study area: 1) A portion of Harmony Grove Road along the project frontage between Wilgen Road and Country Club Drive is proposed to be reclassified from a Collector roadway to a Town Collector roadway; 2) A portion of Country Club Drive along the project frontage between Harmony Grove Road and Kauana Loa Drive is proposed to be reclassified from a Collector roadway to a Modified Rural Light Collector; 3) A new roadway is proposed to connect Country Club Drive to Harmony Grove (proposed as "Village Road") and is proposed to be classified as a Modified Rural Light Collector; and 4) an extension of Avenida del Diablo is proposed to continue the two-lane Rural Light Collector from its current terminus at Citracado Parkway to Country Club Drive. The alternative to the Avenida del Diablo extension is the widening of Harmony Grove Road north of the proposed intersection of new Village Road and Harmony Grove Road.

Offsite Improvements: As noted above, the proposed project includes the extension of an existing off-site roadway and the construction of a new roadway connecting Harmony Grove Road to Country Club Drive.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The project study area consists of rural residential, equestrian/ranch uses, along with two egg ranches, a dairy ranch, avocado groves, citrus groves, and an abandoned rock quarry. The egg and dairy ranches include egg packing facilities, chicken houses, milk barns and out-structures and sheds to support the agricultural land uses. A fertilizer processing operation, and ponds to collect dairy and egg ranch runoff are also located near these facilities.

The topography within the study area undulates with the central portion of the study area consisting of more flat, valley-like topography (approximately 560 feet above mean sea level (amsl)) and the surrounding areas rising to a high of approximately 940 feet amsl in the southeast corner of the site where the abandoned rock quarry is located. Elevations along the western and northwestern boundaries rise to approximately 700-800 feet amsl. A slope analysis prepared for the project site shows that more than half the site is at less than 15% slope and approximately one-quarter of the site has slopes exceeding 25%. Escondido Creek crosses the project study in an east-west direction, south of Harmony Grove Road. A tributary to Escondido Creek cuts through the middle of the site, in a north-south direction.

Vegetation communities in the study area consists primarily of freshwater marsh, riparian woodland, southern willow scrub, mulefat scrub, disturbed wetland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, coast live oak woodland, southern mixed chaparral, and non-native grasslands. Escondido Creek is considered a regionally significant resource and is in fairly good condition. The north-south, unnamed tributary is heavily disturbed and is proposed to be rehabilitated as part of the proposed project.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits	County of San Diego
Construction Permit	
Excavation Permit	
Encroachment Permit	

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
Air Quality Permit to Operate – Title V Permit	APCD
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Industrial Storm water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District
School District Approval	Escondido Union School District Escondido Union High School District
Deannexation and Formation Approval	LAFCO

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

July 1, 2004

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Date

Kristin Blackson

Printed Name

PLANNER II

Title

Harmony Grove Village; ER 04-08-011 - 9 -
SP 04-03, GPA 04-04, R04-010,
TM 5365, P04-012, P04-013, P04-014

July 1, 2004

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

Harmony Grove Village; ER 04-08-011 - 11 -
SP 04-03, GPA 04-04, R04-010,
TM 5365, P04-012, P04-013, P04-014

July 1, 2004

- b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by Bill Stocks in July 2003 and review of planning documents that include the Scenic Highways Element and the North Metropolitan Subregional Plan, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The project site is located both north and south of Harmony Grove Road in the vicinity of the intersection with Country Club Drive.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by Bill Stocks in July 2003 and review of planning documents that include the Scenic Highways Element and the North Metropolitan Subregional Plan, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic highway and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on scenic resources within a designated scenic vista.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed landform modifications include approximately 2,879,800 cubic yards of cut at a maximum cut slope ratio of 1.5:1 and approximately 2,852,500 cubic yards of fill with a maximum fill slope ratio of 2:1. This is about 6,153 cubic yards per acre. This may be acceptable depending on the amount of landform alteration involved, the height of the manufactured slopes and the mitigation measures proposed. Maximum cut height is expected to be 30 feet and maximum fill slope height is anticipated to be 40 feet. No retaining walls are proposed. Some blasting is anticipated for project grading and is identified on the project grading plan.

An extensive landscape plan is proposed as part of the Specific Plan that includes ornamental landscaping, retention of native vegetation and restoration of existing habitats. A detailed visual analysis must be included in the EIR to address the potential aesthetic and landform modification impacts for both on-site and off-site improvements.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 40 miles from the Mount Palomar Observatory. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting.

In addition, the proposed project will control outdoor lighting and sources of glare in the following ways:

1. The project will not install outdoor lighting that directly illuminates neighboring properties.

2. The project will not install outdoor lighting that would cast a direct beam angle towards a potential observer, such as a motorists, cyclist or pedestrian.
3. The project will not install outdoor lighting for vertical surfaces such as buildings, landscaping, or signs in a manner that would result in useful light or spill light being cast beyond the boundaries of intended area to be lit.
4. The project will not install any highly reflective surfaces such as glare-producing glass or high-gloss surface color that will be visible along roadways, pedestrian walkways, or in the line of sight of adjacent properties.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project conforms to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Moreover, the project's additional outdoor lighting and glare is controlled and limits light pollution to the project site or directly around the light source and will not contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensure that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Portions of the project site and surrounding area contain lands designated as Unique Farmland and/or Farmland of Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. As such, potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Unique Farmland and/or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural will occur as a result of this project. Therefore, any potential agricultural impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Agricultural Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Portions of the project site are zoned (A-70) Limited Agriculture and (A-72) General Agriculture, which are considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site supports lands that are included as a part of a Williamson Act Agricultural Preserve (Williamson Act Lands). The proposed project may create a conflict with existing zoning and the Williamson Act contract. Therefore, any potential agricultural impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Agricultural Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site and surrounding area have land designated as Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, support active agriculture and contain prime agricultural soils. As such, potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural may occur as a result of this project. Therefore, any potential agricultural impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Agricultural Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project has the potential to result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board, primarily related to construction operations, diesel toxins, hot spots, and vehicle trips. Therefore, any potential air quality impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Air Quality Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the

eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

Potentially Significant Impact: The primary sources of air pollutants would be from grading and construction activities (short-term) and from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project.

A substantial amount of earthwork is anticipated for site preparation and construction of infrastructure and utilities servicing the Harmony Grove Village and is expected to also require a substantial amount of construction traffic and associated emissions. Potential short-term construction-related air quality impacts should be evaluated in the EIR. In addition, particulate emissions from diesel-fired construction equipment have been added to the list of known carcinogens by the State of California. As such, health impacts from the diesel exhaust associated with the construction activities will be evaluated in the EIR.

The proposed project would result in approximately 9,132 Average Daily Trips (ADT). Emissions associated with project traffic should be evaluated in an Air Quality Technical Report.

In addition to short-term construction and long-term traffic emissions, the proposed project's equestrian facilities may generate fugitive dust and the proposed sewer package treatment plant may generate stationary emissions. Therefore, any potential air quality impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Air Quality Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban

and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. Therefore, any potential air quality impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Air Quality Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

Less Than Significant Impact: Based a site visit conducted by Kristin Blackson on April 16, 2004, no sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) occur of the proposed project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from the proposed equestrian and the sewer package treatment plant. An odor analysis shall be included in the air quality technical study. Therefore, any potential air quality impacts due to odor from the project must be analyzed in an Air Quality Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The site is known to support several sensitive habitats, which support and have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species. The site supports the following sensitive habitats: freshwater marsh, riparian woodland, southern willow scrub, mulefat scrub, disturbed wetland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, coast live oak woodland, southern mixed chaparral, and non-native grassland. Pursuant to the CEQA and the Resource Protection Ordinance (in addition to state and federal laws), impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species must be minimized and often avoided entirely.

Therefore, based on the fact that the site has the potential to support several endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats the project may have a potentially significant impact on biological resources. As such any potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats must be addressed in the context of the biological technical study and the EIR.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The site supports a number of wetland habitats and wetland buffers that were identified on a site visit conducted by Kristin Blackson on April 16, 2004. These wetlands and wetland buffers may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and as proposed the project may not conform to the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers and conformance

with the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated and discussed in the context of a biological technical study and the EIR.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The site contains a number of significant drainages and wetland habitats. Specifically, Escondido Creek and several tributaries bisect the project site, which if impacted may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands that may be considered California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and would potentially require a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" and/or 404 Permit. Therefore, all significant drainages and wetlands must be defined and impacts identified in a biological technical study and in the EIR.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Potential wildlife corridors exist throughout the project site. Wildlife corridors potentially exist along natural drainages through various sensitive habitat types on-site, including: Diegan coastal sage scrub; riparian areas and wetlands. The current project design may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts to wildlife dispersal corridors must be discussed in the biological technical study and the EIR.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated May 28, 2004 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP) Special Area Management Plans (SAMP) or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of historical resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. As a result, the project may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant historical artifact, object, structure, or site. Therefore, the potential for impacts to historic structures will be evaluated in the archaeological survey and discuss the survey results in the context of the EIR.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of archaeological resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. In addition, according to a Cultural Resource Survey, prepared by Brian F. Smith in November 2002, two sites have been identified on site. As a result, the project may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. Therefore, the project must complete an archaeological survey and discuss the survey results in the context of the EIR.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that portions of the project-site is located on geological formations that have paleontological resource potential. Portions of the project site contain geologic formations that are composed either of volcanic rocks or high-grade metasedimentary rocks. As a result, the project may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. Therefore, the project must discuss potential impacts to paleontological resources in the context of the EIR.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of archaeological resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. In addition, according to a Cultural Resource Survey, prepared by Brian F. Smith in November 2002, two sites have been identified on site. As a result, the project may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. Therefore, the project must complete an archaeological survey and discuss the survey results in the context of the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, staff geologist has reviewed the project and has concluded that no other substantial evidence of recent (Holocene) fault activity is present within the project site. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Although the project site is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the project site is subject to ground shaking from seismic activity. Potential impacts created by the exposure of people to hazards related to seismic ground shaking, rockfall, or landslides must be evaluated in a Geotechnical Report and within the context of the EIR.

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The geology of the project site is identified as both plutonic and marine/nonmarine sedimentary deposits. This geologic environment is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Portions of the site are located within a landslide susceptibility zone and may result in a significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from an area susceptible to landslides. A Geotechnical Report will be required in order to determine if either pre-existing or potential conditions are present that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as follows:

Soil Type		Erosion Index
VaB	Visalia sandy loam, 2 to 5% slopes	Severe 16
VaC	Visalia sandy loam, 5 to 9% slopes	Severe 16
ChB	Chino fine sandy loam, 2 to 5% slopes	Severe 16
CID2	Cienega coarse sandy loam, 5 to 15% slopes	Severe 16
CmE2	Cienega rocky coarse sandy loam, 9 to 30% slopes	Severe 16
EsE2	Escondido very fine sandy loam, 15 to 30% slopes	Severe 16
EsD2	Escondido very fine sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes	Severe 16
FvD	Fallbrook-Vista sandy loams, 9 to 15% slopes	Severe 16

These soils have severe erodibility and as proposed the project may result in unprotected erodible soils; may alter existing drainage patterns; may be located a wetland or significant drainage feature; and may develop steep slopes. Even though, the project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations, the project might result in potentially significant erosion. Due to these factors, erosion potential from the project must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is located on or near geological formations that may be unstable or potentially become unstable as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified the following on-site soils having a HIGH shrink-swell behavior:

Soil Type		Shrink/Swell Index
LpD2	Las Posas fine sandy loam, 9 to 15% slopes	High
HrC	Huerhuero loam, 2 to 9% slopes	High
HrC2	Huerhuero loam, 5 to 9% slopes	High
LrG	Las Posas stony fine sandy loam, 30 to 65% slopes	High
LrE	Las Posas stony fine sandy loam, 9 to 15% slopes	High

Soil Type		Shrink/Swell Index
LpE2	Las Posas fine sandy loam, 15 to 30% slopes	High
LpD2	Las Posas fine sandy loam, 30 to 65% slopes	High

All other mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior and are identified as stable with no adverse potential for development activity. A Geotechnical Report will be necessary in order to determine whether these conditions can be mitigated through site design and compliance with the Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Potential impacts from development on soils with high-shrink swell behavior must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The Private Equestrian Ranch (Planning Area 7) proposes to utilize a septic system for effluent treatment/disposal. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH will be required to review the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." The EIR must identify if the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project includes a sewer package treatment plant, which would consist of the following elements: a 17,000 s.f. area with a 20' x 50' building which would house the control room, electrical equipment, air blowers and small lab; an effluent storage area of approximately 40' x 50'; two adjacent equipment lots (15' x 50' and 20' x 50'); and a sludge bed covering an area of approximately 50' x 100'. The project is required to disclose and analyze any potential hazardous materials associated with the operating of the plant within the EIR.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project includes a sewer package treatment plant. The project is required to disclose and analyze any potential hazardous conditions associated with the operating of the plant within the EIR.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:



No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:



No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:




The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated nty and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN



No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan for will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?



- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project may significantly increase the fire hazard if the project is unable to comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. The project has a number of requirements that must be incorporated into the project design to ensure that the project will be in compliance with relevant Fire Codes. Compliance with all the fire requirements and specific details of the project's design consideration must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- i) Expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project does involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities and a sewer package treatment plant facility. Therefore, the project may expose people to significant risk of injury involving vectors. A Vector Management Plan must be developed and approved by the County Department of Environmental Health, Vector Surveillance



Program to ensure people will not be exposed to vectors. The Vector Management Plan will be developed for inclusion in the EIR and analyses.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:



Potentially Significant Impact: The project is not anticipated to violate any waste discharge requirements; however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, compliance with waste discharge requirements must be discussed as a part of the EIR, Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?



- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project lies in the Escondido hydrologic subarea, within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit - that is impaired for Coliform bacteria, nutrients, and sediment. The project may result in an increase of pollutants for which the water body is already impaired and this potential increase must be discussed as a part of the EIR, SWMP and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is not anticipated to create or contribute runoff water that would cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives; however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, applicable surface or groundwater water quality objectives must be discussed as a part of the EIR, SWMP and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Rincon Del Diablo Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:



Potentially Significant Impact: The project is required to be designed to meet the performance standards of the WPO for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. Conformance to the WPO must be demonstrated in the context of the EIR, SWMP and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project could significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff. The project could have adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could significantly impair, impede or accelerate flow in a watercourse or increase erosion or siltation. The project could have significant flood hazards from external sources. The applicant will be required to show lines of inundation to the 100-year flood on the existing watercourse that flows through the property, which will identify the area not to be used or disturbed. Drainage shall be diverted to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.



Inage along roads shall be per County Standards. Building pads will be shown on the plat as located outside the lines of inundation for the 100-year flood plain. The project will be required to address the above-mentioned issues and through a hydrology study be required to identify and analyze any impacts and address appropriate mitigation. Also, these issues are required to be discussed in the EIR.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project could significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff. The project could have adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could significantly impair, impede or accelerate flow in a watercourse. The project could have significant flood hazards from external



sources. The applicant will be required to show lines of inundation to the 100-year flood on the existing watercourse that flows through the property, which will identify the area not to be used or disturbed. Drainage shall be diverted to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities. Drainage along roads shall be per County Standards. Building pads will be shown on the plat as located outside the lines of inundation for the 100-year flood plain. The project will be required to address the above-mentioned issues and through a hydrology study be required to identify and analyze any impacts and address appropriate mitigation. Also, these issues are required to be discussed in the EIR.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:



Potentially Significant Impact: The project may involve potential sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the project must discuss proposed site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable and to ensure compliance with applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses in the context of the EIR and SWMP.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site and on off-site improvement location. Potential impacts due to flood hazards should be identified and discussed within the EIR.



- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:



Potentially Significant Impact: Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site and on off-site improvement location. Potential impacts due to flood hazards should be identified and discussed within the EIR.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site and on off-site improvement location. Potential impacts due to flood hazards should be identified and discussed within the EIR.

- l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: Tsunami – The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?



Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Unless

Mitigation Incorporated



Less than Significant Impact



No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project will develop a new village in place of the existing rural, agricultural area. The project proposes replacement of one low-density use for another higher density use because the land is now ripe for the proposed type of development. For this reason the project is required to prepare an extended study on Land Use and Planning including an assessment of potential impacts to Community Character.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?



Potentially Significant Impact



Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporated



Less than Significant Impact



No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

1. General Plan - Regional Land Use Element

The project proposes a change from the existing Estate Development Area (EDA) Regional Category to the Current Urban Development Area (CUDA) Regional Category. The planned land uses in the vicinity are generally estate residential in nature. The area is changing with higher intensity uses developing

within the City of Escondido to the east. The existing agricultural uses within the project area do appear to be ripe for a change. The CUDA line is adjacent to the north. This line needs to be extended to include this project because the proposed densities would not be possible within the EDA. The Regional Land Use Element indicates that urban development will not occur outside the Urban Limit Line during the life of this plan; however, the end of the plan was expected to be around 1995. A comprehensive update of the General Plan is currently underway as part of GP2020. This project proposes densities and uses that are compatible with those proposed as part of this plan update.

The proposed overall density of 1.58 dwelling units per acre does not seem excessive considering that Harmony Grove is a small but fairly wide and level valley and could accommodate the higher density without extreme landform alteration.

Other amendments include changes to the Circulation Element as follows:

- A portion of Harmony Grove Road between Wigen Road and Country Club Drive is proposed to be reclassified from a Collector roadway to a Town Collector roadway.
- A portion of Country Club Drive between Harmony Grove Road and Kauana Loa Drive is proposed to be reclassified from a collector roadway to a Modified Rural Light Collector.
- A new roadway (Village Road) is proposed to connect country Club Drive to Harmony Grove Road. This roadway is proposed to be classified as a Modified Rural Light Collector.

2. Subregional Plan

The project site is located within the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area. This plan was expected to end, and be updated, around 1990. Generally, it encourages annexation of areas within the sphere of influence of the City of Escondido. One of the ways to encourage annexation is to keep a low density on areas within the sphere. However, if a project has access to sewer, higher density development could be allowed. The North County Metropolitan subregional Plan does not specifically address development within Harmony Grove.

A portion of the project is subject to an "Extractive Overlay". The Regional Land Use Element discusses such overlay areas as follows:

"It is intended to be temporary in the County will initiate a General Plan Amendment to remove the extractive designation once extraction and rehabilitation is complete."

The project proposes to delete the extractive overlay and to change the land use designation to (21) Specific Plan Area. There is an existing quarry that will be rehabilitated as part of the development plans for this project. The area where the quarry is currently located is proposed to be the site of the wastewater treatment plant, in addition to a mixture of residential uses.

3. Harmony Grove Specific Plan

The concept behind this specific plan is to create a rural residential village that blends with the local landscape and responds to the objectives of neighboring residents for a distinctive single-family residential community. It provides a range of housing opportunities to accommodate broad market needs.

In its design, Harmony Grove Village recognizes a desire to live away from the rapid pulse of urban development, but also to be close enough to the advantages of city life. It creates a community that is focused on enhancing quality of life elements. It accommodates minor commercial needs and supplies an equestrian-friendly recreational environment.

At the heart of Harmony Grove Village is the Village Center, an area that mixes commercial, residential, recreational, and public uses. Employing a modified grid pattern of streets, the Village Center is the pedestrian-oriented core of Harmony Grove Village. Here, residents can stroll for neighborhood shopping or access community recreational facilities.

As development moves away from the Village Core, its density and intensity generally diminish with distance. The net result is a concentrated use pattern at the center of the community and a sparse development pattern at the perimeter.

4. Zoning

The project proposes to change the zoning so that it is consistent with the provisions of the proposed Specific Plan Area.

- a. The Land Use/Community Character Study must address all of the findings required to approve the three proposed major use permits as set forth in Section 7358 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- b. The Commercial lots that do not have a site layout and elevations proposed as part of the Major Use Permit must have Design Special Area Regulations ("D" Designator) in the Zoning to assure that future development will complement the character of the Specific Plan.

5. Subdivision Ordinance

- a. Findings
The grounds for disapproval of a Tentative Map are set forth in Section 66474 of the Subdivision Map Act.
- b. Design Standards
The project proposes numerous waivers of the Subdivision Design Criteria set forth in Section 81.401.
- c. Access
Access to the project site is proposed from Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive. Village Road is also proposed which will connect with Avenida del Diablo. Potential access issues occur on lots that will share driveway access or lots that will take access from POA lots that are less than the minimum width required by the Private Road Standards. Of particular concern is Lots 108 111 and 112 that do not appear to have any road or driveway access.

Potential conflicts with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulations must be addressed within the extended study for Land Use/Community Character and discussed within the context of the EIR.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of undetermined mineral resources MRZ-3. Staff geologist Laura Maghsoudlou has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has determined that coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits underlie a large portion of the site. Additionally, an abandoned rock quarry is present along the southeast portion of the site. Therefore, the project may result in the significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource to the region and residents of the state. Based on these circumstances, a Geotechnical Report

will be prepared in order to determine that the project will not result in the future inaccessibility for recovery of the on-site mineral resources.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Portions of the project site are within an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) and have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25). Staff geologist Laura Maghsoudlou has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has also evaluated the potential for non-economic value (i.e. an historical mining site). This assessment has determined that coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits underlie the site. Therefore, as discussed above in a), the project may result in the significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource and will need to be further evaluated within a Geotechnical Report and within the context of the EIR.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to and intersected by Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive and thus is impacted by noise from these Circulation Element roadways. Preliminary noise prediction estimates for existing roadways indicate that without site-specific noise mitigation measures, "noise sensitive" uses at the project site may be impacted by noise levels that exceed the applicable sound level limit of the Noise Element of the General Plan. The addition of a connector street between these two Circulation Element roadways may also require further noise analysis of potential noise impacts to future residences in this proposed development. In addition, the project proposes a wastewater treatment plan within Planning Area 6, which may have potential noise generation impacts.

Policy 4b of the Noise Element of the General Plan specifies that "Whenever it appears that new development will result in any (existing or future) noise sensitive area being subjected to noise levels of CNEL equal to 60 decibels or greater, an acoustical study should be required". The Noise Element defines "noise sensitive area" as "the building site of any residence, hospital, school, library, or similar facility where quiet is an important attribute of the environment." To determine conformance a Noise Analysis must be completed for the project and must be discussed in the EIR.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to and intersected by Harmony Grove Road and Country Club Drive and thus is impacted by noise from these Circulation Element roadways. Preliminary noise prediction estimates for existing roadways indicate that without site-specific noise mitigation measures, “noise sensitive” uses at the project site may be impacted by noise levels that exceed the applicable sound level limit of the Noise Element of the General Plan. The addition of a connector street between these two Circulation Element roadways may also require further noise analysis of potential noise impacts to future residences in this proposed development. In addition, the project proposes a wastewater treatment plan within Planning Area 6, which may have potential noise generation impacts.

Policy 4b of the Noise Element of the General Plan specifies that “Whenever it appears that new development will result in any (existing or future) noise sensitive area being subjected to noise levels of CNEL equal to 60 decibels or greater, an acoustical study should be required”. The Noise Element defines “noise sensitive area” as “the building site of any residence, hospital, school, library, or similar facility where quiet is an important attribute of the environment.” To determine conformance a Noise Analysis must be completed for the project and must be discussed in the EIR.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Although construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410; potential impacts may occur if construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410) are exceeded. To determine conformance, a Noise Analysis must be completed for the project and must be discussed in the EIR.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |


Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

 **Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.


XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |



Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Growth induction is a change in physical circumstance or regulatory issues that would remove a restriction to or encourage an increase in human population or development. A project can be determined to have a growth-inducing impact if it directly or indirectly causes economic or population expansion through the removal of obstacles to growth, actions that are sometimes referred to as "growth accommodating." The proposed project includes the following aspects which may be considered to be growth inducing: an increase in residential density through general plan amendments and rezone applications, a creation of a specific plan area, major improvements to road circulation, reclassification of road  ments, extension of water, gas, and electric lines, a sewage treatment facility and the proposed creation of a County Sanitation District. Growth induction can

result in a wide variety of potential impacts, which must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in the removal of a number of existing single-family homes and replacement with the Harmony Grove Village project that consists of approximately 740 residential units. This project will significantly increase the number and type of housing available in the area.


- c) **Displace** substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|--|---|
|  Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The current owners of the property are residents involved in agricultural uses. Their participation in this process should benefit them substantially to the extent that they would likely be able to purchase one of the new residences if they chose to stay.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or sically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Fire Protection will be provided by both the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and Elfin Forest CSA 107 Volunteer Fire Department. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection does not operate year round. They generally operate with full staffing and open fire stations each year starting in May, and reduce staffing and close fire stations in November or early December of each year depending on weather conditions. Their primary responsibility is the protection of forest, range and watershed land; however, subject to availability of firefighting resources, they may respond to structural, vehicle, and other fires within state responsibility areas. Like other fire agencies, they also respond to a variety of non-fire emergencies.

The Elfin Forest Volunteers operate year round and respond to structural, vehicle, vegetation and other fires and medical aids within the Elfin Forest area. Elfin Forest Fire Department may require facility improvements as part of this project. Specific fire protection requirements for this project are set forth in a letter to the applicant dated January 20, 2004, from Ralph Steinhoff, County Fire Services Coordinator.

The project proposes to receive water service from the Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District except for APN#'s 222-210-03 and 222-210-05. Facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next 5 years based on the capital facility plan of the district. They indicate that they expect the environmental review process to include a Water Supply Assessment in accordance with Senate Bills 610 and 221.

APN#'s 222-210-03 and 222-210-05 are in the Vallecitos Water District. The District indicates that facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next 5 years based on the capital facility plan of the district. They indicate that they expect the environmental review process to include a Water Supply Assessment in accordance with Senate Bills 610 and 221.

The project proposes to form a new sewer district that will provide for the operation and maintenance of the proposed wastewater treatment facility. The project is required to provide complete environmental analysis, as well as policy analysis as set forth in the Public Facility Element.

The project is located within the Escondido Union School District and the Escondido Union High School District and it is eligible for service. Impacts to school facilities will be avoided by the payment of fees pursuant to State Law prior to the issuance of Building Permits.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a residential use that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to provide a combination of public and private recreational facilities, as well as pay PLDO fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland.

Moreover, the project will not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities will remain.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves new recreational facilities. The new facilities include three public parks, a series of private neighborhood parks, a community equestrian facility and a system of public multi-use trails. Therefore, the construction of recreational facilities may have an adverse physical effect on the environment and must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project will generate an expected ADT of 9,132. The addition of 9,132 ADT may result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposal could result in an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity. As a result the EIR and Traffic Analysis are required to analyze the impact of the traffic generated by the project on County & State roads in the area.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project will generate an expected ADT of 9,132. The addition of 9,132 ADT may result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposal could result in a potential degradation of the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. As a result the EIR and Traffic Analysis are required to analyze the impact of the traffic generated by the project on County & State roads in the area.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways; however, road design features along county roads from project accesses must be determined in the sight distance study within the Traffic Analysis. The EIR and Traffic Analysis must determine whether the project increases traffic hazards and provides adequate sight distance for the project.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County; therefore, the project has adequate emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

In addition, the various non-residential uses have been provided with adequate parking area or will be subject to subsequent building permits that will ensure adequate parking area for each use.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The Private Equestrian Ranch (Planning Area 7) proposes to utilize a septic system for effluent treatment/disposal. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH will be required to review the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." The EIR must identify if the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves new and/or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The new and/or expanded facilities include a sewage treatment plant and a network of underground gravity sewer lines. The proposed sewage treatment plant is to be located in the southwest portion of Planning Area 6. The proposed water service will be a system of underground waterlines within the project. Existing waterlines within the site will be removed and



replaced. These new and/or expanded facilities may result in adverse physical effect on the environment. Potential environmental impacts must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project does include new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does involve landform modification any source, treatment or structural Best Management Practices for stormwater. These new and/or expanded facilities may result in adverse physical effect on the environment. Potential environmental impacts must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project site is included in the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) boundary line. The majority of the site is within the Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District (RdDMWD) with the remainder of the site in the Vallecitos Water District. Although, water service availability letters have been received from both water districts, a state mandated water supply assessment is required to determine the projects long-term water supply availability. This assessment will be included and analyzed within the EIR.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |


Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to form a County Sanitation District (Harmony Grove Village Specific Plan Sanitation District), in addition to a wastewater treatment facility, to provide wastewater treatment and reclamation service. The provision of adequate wastewater treatment facilities should be assured through a Sanitation Agreement entered into between the project applicants and the County of San Diego. However, the details of that agreement regarding adequate wastewater capacity must be identified and disclosed within the EIR and appropriate technical studies.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to ommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

July 1, 2004

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these cumulative effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral

Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these significant effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program

Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities

Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>), (www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995.
(<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998.
(www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084.
(www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994).
(www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste.
(ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

ND0704\0408011-ISF